

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1-13, 41-50, 82-92, 98-101, and 103 are pending in the application, with claims 1, 41, 82, 85, 87, 89, 92, and 98 being independent. Claims 14-40, 51-81, 93-97, 104, and 105, which were previously withdrawn, have been canceled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter recited therein to expedite prosecution. Claim 102 has also been canceled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter recited therein. Claims 1, 41-50, 82-89, 92, and 98 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

CONSIDERATION OF PREVIOUSLY FILED INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENTS

Initially, Applicant respectfully requests return of the initialed PTO-1449 forms from the December 11, 2003 and September 2, 2005 Information Disclosure Statements, indicating that the documents listed thereon have been considered.

STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for conducting a telephonic interview with Applicant's attorney, David A. Divine, on October 7, 2005.

During the interview, Applicant's attorney presented arguments pointing out that the cited Acklen document is a user guide for WordPerfect 9. As such, Acklen discloses how to use features of WordPerfect 9, but has not been shown to disclose or suggest the architecture used to implement the program's features.

Nevertheless, in the interest of expediting allowance of the application, and without conceding the propriety of the rejection, Applicant's attorney proposed to amend each of the

independent claims along the lines of currently amended claim 1 below, to further clarify features of Applicant's invention. Applicant's attorney understood the Examiner to tentatively agree that the proposed amendment overcame the outstanding rejections based on Acklen. The Examiner indicated that he would need to update his search, and requested that the proposed amendments be presented in writing.

Accordingly, the independent claims have been amended herein, as discussed during the interview. Applicant submits that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance. If any issues remain that would prevent the allowance of the application, Applicant requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney to resolve the issues.

§102 REJECTION

Claims 1-12, 41-43, 82-84, 98, 102, and 103 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by the publication "Using Corel WordPerfect 9" by Laura Acklen and Read Gilgen (Acklen). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Nevertheless, without conceding the propriety of the rejection, independent claims 1, 41, 82, and 98 have been amended as proposed during the interview to even more clearly recite features of Applicant's invention. Support for the claim amendments can be found in the original disclosure at least at page 8, lines 11-25, page 10, lines 16-20, and FIG. 1. Also, claim 102 has been canceled.

Independent claim 1, as presently presented, recites:

1. An architecture comprising:
a table appearance manager to manage how a table appears in a document; and
a spreadsheet functionality manager to manage spreadsheet functions for the table,
wherein the table appearance manager and the spreadsheet functionality manager are architecturally separate system managers of the architecture.

The Office has not pointed to any portion of Acklen as disclosing or suggesting such features. Acklen is a user manual for WordPerfect 9 and discloses at page 251, a "table feature" of WordPerfect 9, in which "[t]he structure of a table is very much like the structure of a spreadsheet, and in fact, you can even use WordPerfect tables for spreadsheet functions." Acklen describes to a user how to use a user interface of WordPerfect 9 to format tables (see e.g., page 277) and to use spreadsheet formulas in tables (see e.g., page 425).

However, as acknowledged during the interview, the cited portions of Acklen fail to disclose or suggest an architecture comprising "a table appearance manager to manage how a table appears in a document" and "a spreadsheet functionality manager to manage spreadsheet functions for the table, wherein the table appearance manager and the spreadsheet functionality manager are architecturally separate system managers of the architecture," as presently recited in independent claim 1.

For at least the foregoing reasons, independent claim 1 is allowable over Acklen.

Independent claims 41, 82, and 98 are variously directed to one or more computer-readable media or to a computer, and each is allowable for reasons similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 1.

Dependent claims 2-12, 42, 43, 83, 84, and 103 depend from one of independent claims 1, 41, 82, and 98, and each is allowable by virtue of its dependence from the respective base claim, as well as for the additional features that it recites.

§103 REJECTIONS

Claims 13 and 85-92 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Acklen. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claims 85, 87, 89, and 92 each recite, among other things, "wherein the table appearance manager and the spreadsheet functionality manager are architecturally separate system managers of the architecture."

As discussed above, with respect to independent claim 1, the Office does not point to any portion of Acklen as disclosing or suggesting such features. Accordingly, independent claims 85, 87, 89, and 92 are allowable for reasons similar to those discussed above with respect to independent claim 1.

Dependent claims 13, 86, 88, 90, and 91 depend from one of independent claims 1, 85, 87, and 89 and are allowable by virtue of their dependency from the respective base claim, as well as for the additional features that they recite.

Claims 44-50 and 99-101 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Acklen in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,630,126 (Redpath). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 44-50 and 99-101 depend from one of independent claims 41 and 98 and, therefore, each includes all the features of its respective base claim.

Redpath was cited for its alleged teaching of "a plurality of math cells located within a common compound document, all linked together (i.e. dependencies) so that related math parts are evaluated and updated upon user input." However, Redpath has not been shown to remedy the deficiencies in Acklen noted above with respect to independent claims 41 and 98. In

particular, Redpath has not been shown by the Office to disclose or suggest that "the table appearance manager and the spreadsheet functionality manager are architecturally separate system managers of the architecture," as recited in each of independent claims 41 and 98.

Accordingly, dependent claims 44-50 and 99-101 are allowable by virtue of their dependency from claims 41 and 89, respectively, as well as for the additional features that they recite.

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, claims 1-13, 41-50, 82-92, 98-101, and 103 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the §§ 102 and 103 rejections, and an early notice of allowance.

If there are any issues that would prevent allowance of this case, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney to resolve them.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: 10/11/05

By: 

David A. Divine
Lee & Hayes, pllc
Reg. No. 51,275
(509) 324-9256 ext. 233